DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 716 HE 014 323

AUTHOR Grahn, Joyce; And Others
TITLE General College Job Satisfaction Survey, University of Minnesota. Summer 1980.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. General Coll.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 28p.
JOURNAL CIT General College Studies; v16 n1 1980-81

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); *College Faculty; *Compensation (Remuneration); Faculty Promotion; Faculty Workload; Higher Education; Job Enrichment; *Job Satisfaction; *Organizational Climate; Questionnaires; Sex Differences; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Salaries; Tenure; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *University of Minnesota Minneapolis

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken in 1980 of employment attitudes among faculty at the General College of the University of Minnesota, an institution for nontraditional postsecondary education. The long form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was used, with a new demographic questionnaire substituted. The survey sample consisted of 96 teaching, administrative, and student service faculty members employed at least half-time. Results show three work-related factors that strongly satisfy General College faculty: moral values, social service, and activity. It is suggested that these factors might be used in the future to improve overall faculty satisfaction and in faculty recruitment. The identified work-related areas of dissatisfaction cluster around organization and management functions, and include advancement, compensation, and company organization and policies. Full professors were relatively satisfied with advancement; men were more satisfied than women with advancement and security; Ph.D. faculty were more satisfied with security and creativity; those with the longest service were most satisfied with security, social status, and working conditions; faculty with salaries of $30,000 or over were most satisfied with advancement, security, and compensation; and full-time faculty, with moral values, security, and variety. Instructors showed most satisfaction with authority, co-workers, creativity, recognition, responsibility, social status, supervision-human relations, and supervision-technical relations. Female faculty were more satisfied with achievement, activity, authority, and social service, and less satisfied with advancement and security. Other satisfaction levels and categories are highlighted in the report. The survey has resulted in development of faculty hiring, promotion, and tenure guidelines; small group discussion on job reinforcers; and development of a questionnaire more oriented toward the General College environment. The demographic questionnaire is appended. (MSE)

University of Minnesota
general college
STUDIES
Volume XVI
Number 1
1980-81

ED208716

SUMMER, 1980
GENERAL COLLEGE JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

by Joyce Grahn, Peter Kahn and Patrick Kroll

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
General College
Univ of Minn
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

The General College of the University of Minnesota, like many other institutions in the American post-secondary educational system, has experienced over the past decade organizational and philosophical changes, as well as changes in the characteristics of the students it serves. It is likely that adaptation and adjustment will continue to pre-occupy college and university educators during the coming years. The General College Professional Development Committee of 1979-80, concerned about how current and future educational issues might affect the General College faculty, decided to undertake a survey of faculty employment attitudes. This document reports the findings of a job satisfaction survey conducted in the General College during the summer of 1980.

HE 019 323

Editorial Board: The General College Research Group

INTRODUCTION

Few studies in the area of job satisfaction have been conducted at the post-secondary educational level. This fact, along with the importance of educator job satisfaction to the vitality and growth of the General College, as well as the desire to enhance informed communication between the College faculty and administration, prompted the Professional Development Committee to explore the relationship between various personal characteristics of the General College faculty and the faculty's employment attitudes. For the first in a planned series of surveys designed to facilitate better understanding of faculty opinions and attitudes concerning occupational activities, the Professional Development Committee sponsored, through a job satisfaction task force, a faculty job satisfaction survey. It was anticipated that such a study would be of great significance since employment attitudes and satisfaction have an integral relationship to such essential areas of work adjustment as efficiency, productivity, turn-over, performance, loyalty and absenteeism, as well as to such life adjustment factors as mental health, personality growth, self-realization and happiness. It was also expected that the information gathered through a job satisfaction study would prove useful in isolating areas of professional development which the faculty and the College administration could address in the future.

METHOD

Instrument Selection

The General College Job Satisfaction Survey was initiated by the authors of this report acting as a task force of the Professional Development Committee in the summer of 1980.

The authors reviewed as possible survey instruments five national satisfaction questionnaires: Job Description Index; Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire; Job Satisfaction Survey Instrument; National Job Satisfaction Study Instrument and the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. These instruments, along with the possibility of designing a questionnaire focusing more directly on the General College experience, were studied to determine which would be most appropriate for the purposes of the survey. After considerable research and professional consultation with Professors Jerry Gates and David Giese of General College as well as with Research Assistant George Henly of the Department of Vocational Research Psychology at the University of Minnesota, the authors chose for this initial study a standardized, nationally recognized questionnaire, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), long form.

Choosing a standard questionnaire offered advantages but also required making certain trade-offs. The MSQ, a nationally established and widely used measurement instrument, was chosen for a variety of reasons. It provided a pool of comparative data (Baros, 1978) which could expand the value and meaning of the results of the General College survey (Weiss, et al., 1967). Since the MSQ is a respected and validated survey device, the credibility of the survey results is strengthened. Data analysis/interpretation services

were readily available, at a reasonable cost, through the Department of Vocational Research Psychology on campus. Finally, the process of designing, pretesting and validating a questionnaire more appropriate to the General College setting, a necessary and important goal, was seen as a complex, long-term undertaking which could delay the survey.

On the other hand, a national standardized survey device lacks the focus of the particular work environment under study. The authors felt, however, that possible survey weaknesses and confusion that might come from administering a measuring instrument not directly suited to the General College work experience could be dealt with.

Instrument

The long form of the MSQ (Weiss, 1967) provides accurate and consistent information. The long form is made up of 100 items, each referring to a particular occupational reinforcer. Survey subjects choose a single response per questionnaire item among five responses that are available in a Likert type format, the response range being "very dissatisfied", "dissatisfied", "neither", "satisfied", or "very satisfied". The twenty scales developed by factor analytic studies contained in the instrument to measure factors of job satisfaction are presented in Table 1. A twenty-first scale of general overall satisfaction is also included.

The authors made one modification of the questionnaire. The demographic section included with the instrument was discarded and a separate demographic section, a personal data form, (see Appendix A) was written in an attempt to make the questionnaire more substantively and semantically applicable to the personal characteristics of the survey sample.

Survey Sample

The survey sample consisted of 96 teaching, administrative and student service faculty members employed in the General College at 50% or more time during the 1979-80 academic year. The categories, "teaching", "administrative" and "student service" were determined from employment classifications contained in official employee-staff payroll lists.

The rationale for the 50% time cut-off was as follows: the authors felt that staff members employed at less than 50% time are usually temporary, with fewer ties, less involvement and fewer responsibilities than more fully employed faculty. Clerical staff, civil service personnel, teaching assistants and other support staff were also not involved in the survey.

Pilot Study of MSQ at the General College

Prior to conducting the survey, the MSQ long form and the previously mentioned demographic data form were distributed to twelve faculty members randomly selected from the eventual survey pool. The subjects were requested to complete the questionnaire material, keep track of their time, comment on any problems, difficulties or issues that they encountered and to suggest im-

Table 1

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Scales

1. Ability utilization. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
2. Achievement. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.
3. Activity. Being able to be kept busy all the time.
4. Advancement. Chances for advancement on the job.
5. Authority. The chance to tell other people what to do.
6. Company organization policies and practices. The way company policies are put into practice.
7. Compensation. My pay and the amount of work I do.
8. Co-workers. The way my co-workers get along with each other.
9. Creativity. The chance to try my own methods of doing a job.
10. Independence. The chance to work alone on the job.
11. Moral values. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.
12. Recognition. The praise I get for doing a good job.
13. Responsibility. The freedom to use my own judgment.
14. Security. The way my job provides for steady employment.
15. Social service. The chance to do things for other people.
16. Social status. The chance to be "somebody" in the community.
17. Supervision-human relations. The way my boss handles his people.
18. Supervision-technical. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.
19. Variety. The chance to do different things from time to time.
20. Working conditions. The working conditions.

provements. The purpose of the pre-test was to determine the suitability of the MSQ long form and the individualized demographic section for use with the survey group. Eight pre-testers (67%) completed and returned the pre-test materials. One respondent (13%) made no comments. Two respondents (25%) thought the materials ill-suited to the task and favored designing a new instrument for the project. The remaining five respondents (62%) were favorably disposed to the materials chosen for the study.

Data Collection

At the end of the pre-test phase, the survey materials (a numbered questionnaire, a cover letter and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope) were mailed to participating survey subjects during the last week of July, 1980. The cover letter discussed the purpose, nature and benefits of the study, identified the sponsoring College faculty committee and assured the participating survey subjects that their responses would be held strictly confidential. Survey subjects were requested to complete and return the questionnaire within two weeks after receipt in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope. A reminder letter was mailed to all survey participants three weeks after the initial distribution. A final follow-up mailing, during the last week of August, 1980, requested that completed materials be returned no later than mid-September, 1980, after which returned questionnaires would be excluded from the tabulation of survey results.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Data Tabulation

To ensure absolute confidentiality of the individual returned questionnaires, survey results were tabulated and scored by two different data processing services at the University of Minnesota. One data compiler was Computer Services Center of Health Sciences and the other was University of Minnesota Department of Vocational Psychology Research. Initial analysis of the survey results was undertaken by the Department of Vocational Psychology Research under the professional guidance of George Henly, chief research assistant for that department. Expanded data analysis, the basis for this and an upcoming report, was completed by the authors with the professional assistance of George Henly and Professors David Giese, research consultant for General College, and Jerry Gates, Chairman of the General College Professional Development Committee during 1979-80.

Demographic Make-up of Sample

A complete listing of the demographic characteristics of both the survey and response samples is beyond the scope of this discussion. The demographic characteristics of the response group as a whole are contained in Appendix A.

The analysis of the demographic data of the survey and response samples reported in Table 2 was limited by the availability of significant comparative

Table 2

Comparison of Selected Demographic Characteristics of General College Job Satisfaction Survey Sample Based on Distribution Percentages of Survey Group and Returned Questionnaires

Demographic Characteristic	Number and Percentages of Questionnaires Distributed by Category		Number and Percentages of Usable Questionnaires Returned by Category	
SEX				
Male	55	(57%)	40	(63%)
Female	41	(43%)	23	(37%)
Total	96	100%	63	100%
EMPLOYMENT RANK				
Professor	22	(23%)	15	(24%)
Associate Professor	16	(16%)	11	(17%)
Assistant Professor	18	(19%)	13	(21%)
Instructor	9	(9%)	8	(13%)
Teaching Associate	15	(16%)	10	(16%)
Other	16	(17%)	6	(9%)
Total	96	100%	63	100%
EMPLOYMENT STATUS				
Tenure	41	(43%)	29	(46%)
Tenure Track	15	(16%)	11	(17%)
Nontenure Track	40	(41%)	23	(37%)
Total	96	100%	63	100%
OFFICIAL FACULTY APPOINTMENT DESIGNATION				
Student Service	14	(15%)	7	(11%)
Teaching	70	(73%)	52	(83%)
Administrative	12	(12%)	4	(6%)
Total	96	100%	63	100%

data. Excluded from discussion and the reporting table were those demographic categories for which no relevant and reliable comparison data were accessible.

The demographic characteristics of the survey sample reported in Table 2 are discussed from two perspectives. For each demographic category analyzed, the number of questionnaires distributed to each class within that category is listed and translated into a "distribution percentage" revealing the demographic make-up of the survey distribution sample. Additionally, for each class within a demographic category, the number of usable questionnaires returned is reported and translated into a "response percentage" representing the demographic make-up of the survey response sample.

The final demographic statistic discussed in this section, but not reported in Table 2, is "usable questionnaire response rate" which indicates the percentage of usable questionnaires returned by each class within the demographic categories discussed.

Of the 96 questionnaires mailed to survey subjects, 69 (72%) were returned. Of this latter figure, six returned questionnaires were not usable for data analysis because of the limited number of items completed. The remaining figure, 63 usable returned questionnaires, a 66% response rate, was the one used for comparative and analytic discussion.

The first demographic category discussed is sex. Fifty-seven percent of the questionnaires (55) were mailed to male survey subjects and 43% (41) to female survey subjects. Male respondents had a 73% usable questionnaire response rate (40 usable responses) and female respondents a 56% rate (23 usable responses) in comparison to the 66% response rate for the survey group as a whole. Female respondents had a 37% share of the usable questionnaires returned, while male respondents had a 63% survey response percentage. Thus, male survey subjects had a greater representation in the demographic make-up of both the survey distribution and response samples.

The second demographic characteristic discussed is employment rank. The rankings "professor" through "other" were drawn from official employment contract classifications contained in computerized college employee lists. The somewhat vague, all inclusive "other" category included counselors, coordinators, teaching specialists, administrative assistants, and other job classifications that would contain so few survey subjects that to list them individually would have made data analysis cumbersome and could have jeopardized confidentiality of the data. Twenty-three percent of the questionnaires (22) were sent to professors, 17% to associate professors (16), and 19% to assistant professors (18); instructors received 9% (9) of the questionnaires; 16% were distributed to teaching associates (15); and the remaining 17% (16) were received by "others". The class of respondents with the highest number as well as largest share of usable questionnaires returned was "professor" at 15 (a response rate of 68%, representing a 24% share of the questionnaires returned). The "other" category, at 6 (a response rate of 37% and response percentage of 9%) had the least number and percentage of usable questionnaires returned. Associate professors, with 11 usable questionnaires, (a 69% response rate) had a 17% share of the returned questionnaires. Assistant professors (13) had a 21% response percentage and a

response rate of 72%. Teaching associates, with 10 usable returned questionnaires, had a response rate of 67% and a 16% share of the questionnaires returned. Instructors (8) had an 89% response rate and a 13% share of the usable questionnaires returned. Thus, in terms of employment rank, Table 1 reveals that instructors were disproportionately overrepresented in the response demographic make-up while the "other" category was considerably underrepresented in the survey results.

Employment status is the third demographic statistic that is commented on. Tenured survey subjects (41) received 43% of the questionnaires distributed. Sixteen percent (15) were sent to tenure track survey subjects, and nontenure track survey subjects received the remaining 41% (40) of the distributed questionnaires. Twenty-nine tenured survey subjects (71% reponse rate) and 11 tenure track subjects (73% response rate) returned usable questionnaires. Tenured survey subjects made up 46% of the usable responses, and tenure track respondents had a 17% share of the usable questionnaires returned. Nontenure track respondents returned 23 usable questionnaires, a response rate of 58%, comprising 37% of the usable responses. This stable representation of tenure and tenure track respondents in the survey results is in marked contrast to the underrepresentation of nontenure track respondents.

The last demographic statistic discussed is official employment appointment description. Survey subjects with student service related responsibilities (counseling, skills support, etc.) received 15% (14) of the distributed questionnaires. This group had a 50% survey response rate (7) and an 11% share of the usable responses. Seventy-three percent of the questionnaires distributed (70) went to survey subjects with teaching as a primary employment duty. Teaching survey respondents, with 52 usable responses, had a usable questionnaire response rate of 74% and occupied an 83% share of the usable responses. The balance of the distributed questionnaires, 12 (12%), were sent to survey subjects whose employment responsibilities were primarily administrative (administrative assistants, occupational program coordinators, deans, etc.). This class of respondents, with 4 usable questionnaires returned, had the lowest usable questionnaire response rate at 33% and only a 6% share of the responses returned.

Based upon the data reported in Table 2, which shows that teaching survey subjects were overrepresented in survey response percentages, it would appear that in instances in which survey subjects had overlapping employment responsibilities, preventing an exact choice among the stated employment designation categories, a distinct preference for teaching as the perceived appropriate description for their appointment responsibilities was made, notwithstanding official appointment designations to the contrary.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis of the data regarding the General College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey was accomplished by calculating means and standard deviations and by performing analysis of variance procedures. A mean score for scales 1 through 20 can range from 5 (very dissatisfied) to 25 (very satisfied). The general job satisfaction mean score, which is the mean of all individuals' rating of the twenty scales, scale No. 21, can range from 20 (very dissatisfied) to 100 (very satisfied).

The mean scores and standard deviations for the General College MSQ survey are arrayed in Table 3, ranked from "most satisfied" (moral values, mean score = 21.38) to "most dissatisfied" (company organization policies and practices, mean score = 12.52). The lowest standard deviation indicating the greatest faculty agreement was for "responsibility", 3.06; the highest standard deviation indicating the greatest variation in faculty responses was for "compensation", 5.71. The general job satisfaction mean score, a composite of all twenty scales, was 70.87. This score falls midway between "neutral" and "satisfied".

In order to evaluate General College MSQ results in relation to other college faculty perceptions of job satisfactions, faculty job satisfaction findings from similar institutions with similar faculty personal characteristics (demographics) were identified. The comparative groups chosen were Louisiana State University women faculty (Benoit, 1976) and Colorado business teachers (Findley, 1975). Each of these studies provided useful comparisons for the twenty reinforcers. The Louisiana State University study (Table 4) provided comparisions for women in academic settings outside the General College. The Colorado College study (Table 5) consisted of both two- and four-year programs, similar to those in the General College.

The sample for the Colorado business teachers study consisted of a random sample, stratified by sex, of 187 full time teachers of business subjects during the academic year 1974-75 in two-year community colleges and junior colleges and four-year colleges and universities in Colorado. Since a test indicated there was no significant difference in degree of job satisfaction between respondents in two-year and four-year institutions, the two groups were treated as one group of subjects. Sixty of the teachers were from the two-year college. Fifty percent were married males, and 27 percent were married females; 10 percent were unmarried males, and 13 percent were unmarried females. Fifty percent were 31 to 40 years old. Of the 127 four-year business teachers studied, 65 percent were married males, 18 percent were married females, 8 percent were unmarried males, and 9 percent were unmarried females. Forty-one percent of the respondents were in the 41 to 50 age bracket.

The Louisiana State University women faculty consisted of a stratified random sample of 220 women employed by the state universities of Louisiana during the academic year 1975. Twenty-three percent were between the ages of 50 and 60; fifty-seven percent were married.

The MSQ results for Louisiana State University women faculty are presented in Table 4. The scale ranking by mean scores for the three most satisfied and three most dissatisfied scales is similar for the three groups. The Louisiana State University women faculty ranked "supervision-human relations" 17 compared to the General College faculty rank of 13. The Colorado business teachers ranked "authority" 16 compared to the General College faculty's 12, and "working conditions" 11 compared to the General College faculty's 16.

The range of mean scores for Louisiana State University women faculty was 14.06 to 21.46 for Colorado business teachers the range was 13.04 to 19.91; and for General College faculty it was 12.52 to 21.38. Again, the results appear similar.

Table 3

General College Faculty Mean Scores For
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Rank	Scale	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
1	Moral values	21.38	3.13
2	Social service	21.05	3.38
3	Activity	20.35	3.55
4	Creativity	20.21	4.56
5	Achievement	19.87	3.64
6	Responsibility	19.76	3.06
7	Independence	19.62	3.65
8	Ability utilization	19.49	4.35
9	Variety	19.43	3.48
10	Co-workers	18.65	3.83
11	Social status	17.81	3.66
12	Authority	17.14	3.46
13	Supervision-human relations	16.40	4.83
14	Supervision-technical	16.02	4.68
15	Security	15.79	6.02
16	Working conditions	14.97	5.52
17	Recognition	14.65	3.61
18	Advancement	13.27	5.68
19	Compensation	12.56	5.71
20	Company policies & practices	12.52	4.88
21	General job satisfaction	70.87	11.86

Table 4

Louisiana State University Women Faculty
Mean Scores For
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Rank	Scale	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
1	Moral values	21.46	3.90
2	Social service	21.19	3.85
3	Activity	20.27	3.09
4	Achievement	19.83	4.25
5	Creativity	19.56	5.61
6	Independence	19.45	4.61
7	Responsibility	19.24	4.40
8	Ability utilization	19.09	5.62
9	Variety	18.98	4.72
10	Social status	18.71	3.97
11	Co-workers	18.64	4.40
12	Authority	18.10	4.10
13	Security	18.04	5.03
14	Working conditions	17.10	5.80
15	Recognition	16.77	5.31
16	Supervision-technical	16.63	5.58
17	Supervision-human relations	16.30	6.05
18	Compensation	14.72	6.11
19	Advancement	14.63	5.68
20	Company policies & practices	14.06	5.60
21	General job satisfaction	73.14	

Table 5

Colorado Business Teachers Mean Scores
For Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Results

Rank	Scale	Mean Score
1	Moral values	19.91
2	Social service	19.89
3	Creativity	19.83
4	Activity	19.43
5	Ability utilization	19.13
6	Achievement	19.03
7	Responsibility	18.72
8	Variety	18.54
9	Independence	18.39
10	Co-workers	17.44
11	Working conditions	16.76
12	Social status	16.53
13	Security	16.11
14	Recognition	15.80
15	Supervision-human relations	15.56
16	Authority	15.31
17	Supervision-technical	14.81
18	Advancement	14.23
19	Company policies & practices	13.79
20	Compensation	13.04
21	General job satisfaction	68.41

The general job satisfaction mean scores also appear similar. The mean for the Louisiana State University women faculty was 73.14; for the Colorado business teachers it was 68.41; and for the General College faculty it was 70.87.

Standard deviation for Louisiana State University women faculty and General College faculty appear similar. Results in Table 4 indicate that "creativity", "responsibility", "ability utilization", "variety", "supervision-human relations", and "recognition" mean scores appeared somewhat more widely distributed and "security" more clustered than General College faculty mean scores. Standard deviations were not available for Colorado business teachers. Interestingly, there was no significant difference in degree of job satisfaction according to personal characteristics for the Colorado teachers. Analysis of variance procedures were not used to analyze job satisfaction of Louisiana State University faculty women.

Analysis of variance was used to determine whether certain demographic variables influenced the key variable, job satisfaction. The results of the procedure were deemed statistically significant if the p value was less than or equal to .05. The significant analysis of variance findings, $p \leq .05$, for each of the twenty scales, plus the general job satisfaction scale, are presented in Appendix B.

The analysis of the findings is in two parts. First, the scales indicating the highest and lowest levels of job satisfaction will be examined. Second, satisfaction levels of various categories of General College faculty will then be analyzed. The authors arbitrarily chose to examine six reinforcers: three indicating the highest level of satisfaction (moral values, social service, activity) and three indicating the lowest level of job satisfaction (advancement, compensation, company organization policies and practices). Means vary from 5, for "very dissatisfied", to 25 for "very satisfied". The moral values mean score indicates that General College faculty members were relatively satisfied in being able to do things that do not go against their consciences. Full time (100%) faculty members exhibited a higher mean score (21.82) than faculty with 50% to 75% appointments (19.86).

The General College faculty social service mean score (21.05) indicates that there was relatively high satisfaction with the chance to do things for people. The female faculty mean score was 22.30, somewhat higher than the male faculty mean score of 20.33.

The third highest job satisfaction reinforcer mean score was 20.35, reported for "activity". Females expressed higher satisfaction (mean score 22.04) than males (mean score 19.38) with "activity" (being able to be kept busy all the time). For this same reinforcer, female tenured or tenure track respondents expressed the highest job satisfaction mean score (23.38) followed in order by female nontenured track (21.33), male tenured (20.08), male tenure track (19.43), and male nontenured (17.13).

The lowest reinforcer mean score expressed by General College faculty, 12.52, was for "company organization policies and practices." Only the findings for years of employment in General College were significant. Faculty who have been employed in the General College three to four years reported

the lowest mean score (8.14), followed in ascending order by faculty with service of five to ten years (11.33), eleven to twenty-three years (14.08), twenty-four or more years (14.92), and one to two years (15.45).

The General College faculty mean score for "compensation" was 12.56. Assistant professors expressed the lowest satisfaction mean score (8.85) regarding pay and the amount of work done. Faculty in the "other" category reported a somewhat higher mean score (11.17), followed in ascending order by instructors (12.38), teaching associates (12.70), associate professors (12.73), and professors (16.2). Tenure track faculty compensation mean score was 7.18, followed in ascending order by nontenured (12.52), and tenured (14.62).

Faculty receiving $15,000 or $19,999 reported a compensation mean score of 8.85, followed in ascending order by faculty receiving $10,000 to $14,999 (11.77), $20,000 to $24,999 (12.25), $5,000 to $9,999 (13.88), $25,000 to $29,999 (14.25), and $30,000 or more (18.43). It is interesting to note the wide variation in responses in the $5,000 to $9,999 category indicated by the standard deviation of 7.14.

The third lowest reinforcer mean score was reported for "advancement," 13.27. Variation in advancement scores can be explained by sex, rank, status, class, years in General College, and salary of respondents. The female faculty mean score was 10.91 compared to the male faculty mean score of 14.64, indicating the females were relatively less satisfied with chances for advancement on the job. Professors reported the highest level of satisfaction (mean score = 18.27), followed in descending order by instructors (13.75), associate professors (13.00), assistant professors (12.31), teaching associates (9.90), and other (8.33). Tenured faculty members were more satisfied (mean score, 15.24), followed by tenure track (13.64), and nontenured faculty (10.61). Male tenured faculty reported the highest mean score (15.52), followed in descending order by female tenured and tenure track (13.63), male tenure track (13.57), male nontenured (12.75), and female nonteured (9.47).

Faculty with the largest number of years of service, 24 or more, reported the highest satisfaction mean score (17.17), followed in descending order by faculty with eleven to twenty-three years (15.75), one to two years (13.27), five to ten years (11.08), and three to four years (9.71). Faculty earning the highest salary, $30,000 or more, reported the highest mean score (18.43), followed in descending order by faculty earning $25,000 to $29,999 (17.63), $15,000 to $19,999 (13.15), $20,000 to $24,999 (12.33), $5,000 to $9,999 (11.63), and $10,000 to $14,999 (10.00).

As previously mentioned, the second cut at analyzing the survey finding was by faculty demographics: rank, sex, status of respondents, degree of respondent, years of service, salary, and percentage of appointment. This discussion is a highlight of the results presented in Appendix B. Variability in responses to eleven questions can be partially explained by rank of respondent. Professors gave relatively high satisfaction ratings for advancement (18.27), compensation (16.20), and security (21.13). Assistant professors gave low (both relatively and absolute) ratings of satisfaction with compensation (8.85), recognition (10.85), human relations supervision (13.31), and technical supervision (12.62). Instructors repor-

ted high satisfaction mean scores for authority (20.38), co-workers (22.38), creativity (22.50), recognition (18.38), responsibility (22.50), social status (20.00), human relations supervision (19.00) and technical supervision (19.00). Respondents in the "other" category reported relatively low satisfaction for advancement (8.33), authority (15.33), co-workers (16.33), creativity (14.50), recognition (10.17), responsibility (16.00), security (9.83), social status (13.17), human relations supervision (11.50), and technical supervision (12.50).

Variability in six questions can be explained partially by sex of respondent. Female faculty members reported high mean scores for achievement (21.30), activity (22.04), authority (18.39), and social service (22.30) but reported lower scores for advancement (10.91) and security (13.04) than males.

Status of respondent partially explained the variability in the advancement, compensation, and security scales. In each scale, tenured faculty reported the highest mean scores (advancement, 15.24; compensation, 14.62; security, 20.41). Compensation mean scores fell into the dissatisfied range. Nontenured faculty reported lowest mean scores for advancement (10.61) and security (11.17). Tenure track faculty reported a mean score of 7.18 for compensation. This is an extremely low score. Tenure track mean scores for advancement, compensation and security fell on the dissatisfied side. By combining "sex of respondent" and "status of respondent" into one analysis of variance procedure, three mean score scales were explained: activity, advancement, and security. In two scales male tenured faculty reported the highest mean scores: advancement, 15.52, and security, 20.32. Male nontenured faculty reported the lowest mean score (17.13) for achievement. Female nontenured employees reported the lowest mean scores for two scales: advancement (9.47) and security (10.93). Both of the mean scores fell well into the dissatisfied range. The lowest mean score for activity scale was for male nontenured (17.13).

Degree of the respondent was useful in partially explaining the variation in creativity and security. In both cases the BA-BS degree had the lowest mean scores (creativity, 16.00, security, 10.88). Respondents with Ph.D. degrees reported highest satisfaction mean scores (creativity, 21.31, security 18.28).

Years of service in the General College partially explained the variation of responses in six questions. Respondents with greater than eleven years (11-23 and 24 or more) reported highest satisfaction mean scores for advancement (15.75 and 17.17), recognition (18.00 and 17.67), security (18.17 and 20.67), social status (18.83 and 19.58), and working conditions (17.42 and 17.00). The highest mean scores for company policies and practices were reported for one to two years of service (15.45). Lowest job satisfaction mean scores for respondents with three to four years of service were reported for advancement (9.71), company organization policies and practices (8.14), recognition (11.29), security (10.71), social status (15.65), and working conditions (11.29).

Salary of respondent partially explained the variation in three job satisfaction scales. Highest satisfaction mean scores were reported by respondents earning $25,000 to $29,999, and $30,000 or more, for advancement (17.63 and 18.43), compensation (14.25 and 18.43), and security (20.63 and 21.00). Lowest mean scores were reported for respondents earning $10,000 to $14,999 for advancement (10.00) and security (11.08). Lowest mean score for compensation was reported by faculty earning $15,000 to $19,999 (8.85).

Percentage of appointment time partially explained the variation in three questions. Full time faculty members reported higher mean score than faculty working 50% to 75% time for moral values (21.82), security (17.06), and variety (19.96).

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The MSQ survey in the General College isolated three work-related factors that strongly satisfy General College faculty: moral values, social service, and activity. These three reinforcers seem to reward the General College faculty and apparently are not potential areas of conflict between faculty and administration. These positive reinforcers might, therefore, be utilized to improve overall General College faculty satisfaction. They could also be used in recruiting new faculty.

The survey also identified work-related areas of dissatisfaction which cluster around organization and management functions. They include advancement, compensation, and company organization and policies. The faculty and administration could consider ways for improving faculty job satisfaction such as, for example: 1) developing clear, relevant and practical guidelines for promotion and tenure, and presenting them in a persuasive manner; 2) encouraging increased communication between administration and faculty regarding the rationale behind certain administrative policies and practices; 3) establishing a program for on-going development of administrative personnel; 4) identifying meaningful, nonmonetary rewards and utilizing them when and where appropriate; 5) mobilizing an effort to educate the College's various publics, such as the legislature, regarding General College salary levels.

Certain segments of the College faculty reported highest levels of satisfaction. Full professors were relatively satisfied with advancement; men were more satisfied than women with advancement and security; tenured faculty were relatively satisfied with security; Ph.D. faculty with creativity and security; those with longest years of service with security, social status, and working conditions; faculty with salaries of $30,000 or more for advancement, compensation, and security; and full-time faculty with moral values, security, and variety. None of these results is particularly surprising, since full-time professors tend to be male and tenured, have the highest salaries, and have been in the College longer.

Instructors reported highest levels of satisfaction for authority, co-workers, creativity, recognition, responsibility, social status, supervision-human relations, and supervision-technical relations. It may be that because instructors are new on the job and fresh and enthusiastic, their levels of satisfaction are very high.

Female faculty members are more satisfied with achievement, activity, authority, and social service, and less satisfied with advancement and security than are male faculty members. It would seem reasonable to conclude that women feel that they accomplish much, are kept busy, have an opportunity to tell people (students) what to do, and have the chance to do things for other people, but are dissatisfied with their opportunities for advancement and security.

Lowest levels of satisfaction--and in some cases high dissatisfaction--were reported by faculty in the "other" category. The authors had a problem categorizing this group. It may be that this is a symptom that reflects a generalized work environment condition.

Other categories of the faculty that expressed low satisfaction mean scores were nontenured faculty (advancement, security) and tenure track faculty (compensation). Male nontenured faculty reported satisfaction lowest with achievement, whereas female nontenured faculty reported low satisfaction with advancement and security. Lowest levels of satisfaction were reported by faculty who had been employed 3 to 4 years in the College in the following areas: advancement, company organization policies and practices, recognition, security, social status, and working conditions. Faculty members earning $10,000 to $14,999 reported lowest satisfaction for advancement and security, whereas faculty earning $15,000 to $19,999 reported lowest satisfaction for compensation. Once again, there is considerable overlap. Lowest levels of job satisfaction were reported by our junior faculty.

The above findings should be of concern to every member of the General College faculty. As the College approaches future challenges as a result of decreased funding and possible reduced enrollment, it is in need of innovative and creative leadership. The College needs total commitment from all of the faculty working together in harmony for curriculum development, teaching methods experimentation, and research.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The authors consider the results of this study a beginning, not an ending. Three different sets of activities are being undertaken in General College as a result of this survey.

1. During 1980-81, the Professional Development Committee began the process of developing guidelines for hiring, promotion, and tenure. These guidelines should reduce faculty feelings of confusion and ambiguity in this area; ultimately these guidelines should help raise job satisfaction levels.

2. The General College administration, with the assistance of the Professional Development Committee Job Satisfaction task force, is making plans for small group discussions focusing on job reinforcers at the Fall, 1981, Faculty Retreat. Faculty members will be asked to rank and weight items in the General College reward system.

3. The task force is considering the development of a special instrument to measure General College job satisfaction. The MSQ study of the

summer of 1980 helped identify areas of satisfaction. However, there is a definite need for a job satisfaction questionnaire specifically designed to meet the needs of academic institutions in general and the General College in particular. Such a questionnaire could be used periodically to evaluate the working environment; it could focus, for example, on faculty perceptions of what work priorities should be in the General College. The questionnaire could be developed so as to identify what time and commitment should be devoted to such activities as advising, teaching and research, for example, and what should be the rewards for these kinds of work.

In the opinion of the members of the task force, the opportunities and challenges identified in this report deserve further study.

APPENDIX A

GENERAL COLLEGE JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

Summer, 1980

CONFIDENTIAL

Both the demographic section and the questionnaire items have been designed to preserve anonymity of response and to avoid embarassing personal, sensitive, or private topics. If you feel a particular question is offensive, unduly prying, or irrelevant to your employment responsibilities, please feel free to omit responding to it. Your answers to the questions and all other information you give us will be held in STRICTEST CONFIDENCE.

---

1. Sex: 40 Male 23 Female

2. Age: ___18-22 ___23-27 ___28-32 ___33-37 ___38-42 ___43-47
   ___48-52 ___53-57 ___58-62 ___63-65 ___over 65

3. Highest academic degree awarded:

   8 B.A./B.S. or equivalent

   24 M.A./M.S. or equivalent

   31 Ph.D. or equivalent

   ___Other:_____

4. Present rank:

   15 Professor

   11 Associate Professor

   13 Assistant Professor

   8 Instructor

   10 Teaching Assistant

   6 Other: _____(coordinator, teaching specialist, etc.)

5. Present employment status:

   29 Tenure 11 Tenure Track 23 Nontenure-Track

6. Length of service at General College in your present rank: ____Years

7. Overall length of service at General College: ____Years

8. Category that most accurately describes your present official appointment (choose one):

   __7__ Student Service Faculty

   __52__ Teaching Faculty

   __4__ Administrative Faculty

9. Time assigned to present official appointment (includes both nine and twelve month appointments):

   __49__ 100%

   __7__ 75%

   __4__ $66\frac{2}{3}$ %

   __3__ 50%

10. General College annual salary base (employment contract rate) for the upcoming academic year:

    __9__ $ 5,000 - $ 9,999

    __13__ $10,000 - $14,999

    __14__ $15,000 - $19,999

    __12__ $20,000 - $24,999

    __8__ $25,000 - $29,999

    __4__ $30,000 - $34,999

    __3__ $35,000 and over

11. Does your General College annual salary base (employment contract rate) constitute 75% or more of your total family income?

    ____Yes ____No

12. Office setting:

    __29__ Private __14__ Paired __20__ More than two

APPENDIX B

General College Faculty
Mean Scores...MSQ
Scales 1-21 by Personal Characteristics
$p \leq .05$

	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
#2 Achievement	19.49	4.35
Sex		
Male	19.05	3.20
Female	21.30	3.98
#3 Activity	20.35	3.55
Sex		
Male	19.38	3.54
Female	22.04	2.95
Class		
Male Tenured	20.08	2.96
Male Tenure Track	19.43	2.70
Male Nontenured	17.13	5.08
Female Tenure or Tenure Track	23.38	1.92
Female Nontenured	21.33	3.20
#4 Advancement	13.27	5.68
Sex		
Male	14.64	5.34
Female	10.91	5.58
Rank		
Professor	18.27	4.10
Associate Professor	13.00	5.35
Assistant Professor	12.31	4.68
Instructor	13.75	5.97
Teaching Associate	9.90	5.26
Other	8.33	3.67
Status		
Tenured	15.24	5.61
Tenure Track	13.64	4.23
Nontenured	10.61	5.49
Class		
Male Tenured	15.52	5.44
Male Tenure Track	13.57	4.61
Male Nontenured	12.75	5.60
Female Tenure or Tenure Track	13.63	5.45
Female Nontenured	9.47	5.26
Years in GC		
1-2	13.27	6.05
3-4	9.71	4.70
5-10	11.08	4.62
11-23	15.75	4.94
24 or more	17.17	5.52

	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
#4 Advancement (continued)		
Salary		
$ 5,000-$ 9,999	11.63	6.84
$10,000-$14,999	10.00	4.45
$15,000-$19,999	13.15	4.83
$20,000-$24,999	12.33	5.25
$25,000-$29,999	17.63	4.41
$30,000 or more	18.43	4.20
#5 Authority	17.14	3.46
Sex		
Male	16.43	3.11
Female	18.39	3.74
Rank		
Professor	17.67	2.58
Associate Professor	17.09	3.91
Assistant Professor	16.15	2.41
Instructor	20.38	3.38
Teaching Associate	16.20	3.85
Other	15.33	4.09
#6 Company Organization Policies and Practices	12.52	4.88
Years in GC		
1-2	15.45	5.35
3-4	8.14	2.25
5-10	11.33	3.42
11-23	14.08	4.91
24 or more	14.92	4.72
#7 Compensation	12.56	5.71
Rank		
Professor	16.20	5.03
Associate Professor	12.73	4.45
Assistant Professor	8.85	4.30
Instructor	12.38	8.09
Teaching Associate	12.70	5.23
Other	11.17	5.49
Status		
Tenured	14.62	4.81
Tenure Track	7.18	3.46
Nontenured	12.52	6.07
Salary		
$ 5,000-$ 9,999	13.88	7.14
$10,000-$14,999	11.77	5.86
$15,000-$19,999	8.85	4.47
$20,000-$24,999	12.25	4.03
$25,000-$29,999	14.25	4.77
$30,000 or more	18.43	4.65

	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
#8 Co-workers	18.65	3.83
Rank		
Professor	18.47	3.85
Associate Professor	18.73	2.83
Assistant Professor	17.23	3.90
Instructor	22.38	2.50
Teaching Associate	19.10	3.87
Other	16.33	4.18
#9 Creativity	20.21	4.56
Degree		
BA-BS	16.00	6.09
MA-MS	20.13	5.02
PhD or other	21.31	3.08
Rank		
Professor	21.33	3.29
Associate Professor	20.27	4.05
Assistant Professor	21.15	3.44
Instructor	22.50	1.92
Teaching Associate	18.80	6.39
Other	14.50	5.51
#11 Moral Values	21.38	3.13
Percentage time of appointment		
100%	21.82	2.74
50-75%	19.86	4.00
#12 Recognition	14.65	3.61
Rank		
Professor	17.67	4.73
Associate Professor	16.27	3.87
Assistant Professor	10.85	4.06
Instructor	18.38	5.88
Teaching Associate	13.00	5.77
Other	10.17	5.15
Years in GC		
1-2	15.91	6.35
3-4	11.29	4.23
5-10	11.67	5.48
11-23	18.00	4.00
24 or more	17.67	4.79
#13 Responsibility	19.76	3.06
Rank		
Professor	20.47	2.03
Associate Professor	19.82	2.27
Assistant Professor	19.00	2.86
Instructor	22.50	2.67
Teaching Associate	19.70	2.79
Other	16.00	4.29

	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
#14 Security	15.79	6.02
Sex		
Male	17.38	5.15
Female	13.04	6.53
Degree		
BA-BS	10.88	6.90
MA-MS	14.04	5.41
PhD or other	18.28	5.11
Rank		
Professor	21.13	2.36
Associate Professor	19.27	2.06
Assistant Professor	15.23	4.60
Instructor	13.00	7.71
Teaching Associate	10.50	4.74
Other	9.83	5.19
Status		
Tenured	20.41	2.57
Tenure Track	13.27	2.97
Nontenured	11.17	6.01
Class		
Male Tenured	20.32	2.59
Male Tenure Track	13.43	3.65
Male Nontenured	11.62	5.40
Female Tenured or Tenure Track	17.00	4.75
Female Nontenured	10.93	6.49
Years in GC		
1-2	12.82	5.69
3-4	10.71	4.16
5-10	16.58	6.79
11-23	18.17	4.71
24 or more	20.67	2.39
Percentage time of appointment		
100%	17.06	5.51
50-75%	11.35	5.80
Salary		
$ 5,000-$ 9,999	11.50	6.41
$10,000-$14,999	11.08	6.14
$15,000-$19,999	14.38	4.17
$20,000-$24,999	19.33	2.31
$25,000-$29,999	20.63	2.45
$30,000 or more	21.00	2.58
#15 Social Service	21.05	3.38
Sex		
Male	20.33	3.54
Female	22.30	2.72

	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
#16 Social Status	17.81	3.66
Rank		
Professor	19.80	2.60
Associate Professor	17.73	2.61
Assistant Professor	17.31	2.18
Instructor	20.00	3.21
Teaching Associate	16.60	4.48
Other	13.17	4.75
Years in GC		
1 -2	16.91	4.16
3 -4	15.65	4.14
5 -10	18.75	3.19
11 -23	18.83	2.44
24 or more	19.58	2.97
#17 Supervision-human relations	16.40	4.83
Rank		
Professor	17.73	4.18
Associate Professor	17.18	3.49
Assistant Professor	13.31	4.97
Instructor	19.00	5.90
Teaching Associate	18.40	2.17
Other	11.50	4.46
#18 Supervision-technical	16.02	4.68
Rank		
Professor	17.67	4.08
Associate Professor	16.82	3.03
Assistant Professor	12.62	4.46
Instructor	19.00	6.05
Teaching Associate	16.80	2.62
Other	12.50	5.01
#19 Variety	19.43	3.48
Percentage time of appointment		
100%	19.96	2.93
50-75%	17.57	4.61
#20 Working Conditions	14.97	5.52
Years in GC		
1 -2	16.82	4.88
3 -4	11.29	4.10
5 -10	13.75	7.42
11 -23	17.42	3.75
24 or more	17.00	4.97
#21 General Satisfaction	70.87	11.86
Rank		
Professor	76.80	11.06
Associate Professor	71.64	7.15

#21 General Satisfaction (cont'd.)

Assistant Professor	66.69	8.52
Instructor	79.88	12.44
Teaching Associate	67.50	11.41
Other	58.67	14.76

References

Baros, Oscar K. Eighth Annual Mental Measurements Yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1978, pp. 1677-1679.

Benoit, Sallye Starks. Job Satisfaction Among Faculty Women in Higher Education in the State Universities of Louisiana, unpublished PhD Thesis, The Louisiana State University and Agriculture and Mechanical College, 1976.

Findley, Benjamin Flavious Jr. The Relationship Among Selected Personal Variables and Job Satisfaction of College Business Teachers in Colorado, unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1975.

Weiss, David J.; Dawis, Rene V.; England, George W.; and Lofquist, Lloyd H. Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center Bulletin 45; Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation 22. Minneapolis, October, 1967.